

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/620,067	07/14/2003	Robert Douglas Christiansen	100204030-1	7123	
22879 HEWLETT PA	7590 02/27/2009 ACKARD COMPANY	EXAM	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION			KASSA, HILINA S		
	NS, CO 80527-2400	NISTRATION	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2625		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/27/2009	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM mkraft@hp.com ipa.mail@hp.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/620,067	CHRISTIANSEN, ROBERT DOUGLAS
Examiner	Art Unit
HILINA S. KASSA	2625

	TILLINA O. TAOOA	2020	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>\( \) The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following i application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing</li> </ul>			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date vanue been flied is the date for purposes of determining the period of exhander 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above; if checked, Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the properties of the properties of</li></ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b</li> </ol>	ut prior to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause
<ul><li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor</li></ul>		E below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying ti	ne issues for
appeal; and/or		and delace	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number or finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			DTOL OOM
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		npliant Amendment (	F I OL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all- non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owabie ir submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-22.			
Claim(s) rejected. 1722.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appea	I and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	or the status or the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ea.
11. The reguest for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT slace the application in	condition for allowers	os kacques:
See Continuation Sheet.	COOKS 14C + plants e in apparocaso 141	CONTRACT TO SHOPE	00-10-00-00-00-0
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13.  Other: .			
/David K Moore/	/Hilina S Kassa/		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625	Examiner, Art Unit 2625		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arugments presented are not persuasive. On page 9, Applicant argues "(1) whether a print job, such as a RIPed version of a print job, can be considered a parameter; and, (2) whether generating a RIPed version of a print job can be considered configuring"

With respect to Applicant's argument (1), the Examiner would like to point the arguments made on the final rejection. Applicant's specification as shown in figure 1, 124 in 120, the RIPing parameters are described as print job and/or default values, download address, etc. This explanation is clear that the and/or combination reflects "one or the other" or "one and the other", in this senario print job is one of the Riping parameters. Thus, the arugment is not persuasive.

With respect to Applicat's argument (2), the Examiner would like to point to the arugments made on the final rejection. In the last arugment, Applicant has provided definition for the word "configuration" as being the way in which something is set up and the definition for "generate" taken from www.dictionary.com, is to set off/bring into existance or produce. Thus, it is clear from the definition that both terms imply the setting of something in this case Riped versio of a print job. Thus, the arugment is not persuasive.